

Attorney Docket No.: 113335CON2

**REMARKS****Double Patenting Rejection**

Claims 26-108 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Contrary to what is stated in the Office action, the claims in the present application are not directed to the same subject matter as the claims in U. S. Patents 6,483,912 and 6,748,070. The claims in those patents are directed to a method for allocating network resources in which reserving resources for a call and committing those resource for the call occur in a particular sequence. In particular, claim 1 in each of the cited patents recites that a) a plurality of network resources is reserved before any one network resource from the plurality of reserved network resources is committed, and b) the reserved plurality of network resources are committed for the call when the called party indicates acceptance for the call.

The present application is directed to a different invention altogether.

In particular, the claims of the present application are directed to methods involving, for example, the routing of messages, e.g., signaling messages, through a network to establish a call. In contradistinction to the various claims of the '912 and '070 patents, the claims of the present application do not involve either the reserving or the committing of resources. Thus, contrary to what is stated in the Office action, a new invention and/or a new improvement is being claimed in the present application. Applicants are not seeking to claim broadly that which had been previously described in more detail in the cited patents. Rather, applicants are seeking to claim different subject matter altogether.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 26-108 as being unpatentable over the claims of the '912 and '070 patents is not proper and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Attorney Docket No.: I13335CON2

U.S. Patent 6,324,279

The preliminary amendment that accompanied the filing of this application pointed to another patent owned by the assignee of the present application, namely United States Patent 6,324,279. In the REMARKS section of that preliminary amendment, applicants suggested that the examiner compare independent claims 50, 65, 72, 79, 83, 91 and 100 of the present application with various ones of independent claims 1, 15, 29 and 43 of the '279 patent, as well as their respective dependent claims. The '279 patent, like the present application contains claims directed to methods involving, for example, the routing of messages, e.g., signaling messages, through a network to establish a call.

Applicants again invite the examiner to consider the claims of the present application in light of the claims of the '279 patent.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles R. Kalmanek, Jr. et al

By:  \_\_\_\_\_

Ronald D. Slusky  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 26,585  
(212) 246-4546

Office of Ronald D. Slusky  
Registered Patent Attorney  
353 West 56<sup>th</sup> St.—Suite 5L  
New York, New York 10019-3775  
Date: 10/18/04